

The 2005 Detroit Jewish Population Study



REPORT ON PHILANTHROPIC GIVING





November 2007

On behalf of the Combined Boards of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit and United Jewish Foundation, we are very pleased to present this special *Report on Philanthropic Giving*. It is one of a series of reports that are being developed to provide more in-depth analysis of specific issues identified in the comprehensive *2005 Detroit Jewish Population Study*. The Population Study provides important data to assist the Federation, local agencies and area synagogues in setting their agenda, in advancing major planning and service initiatives and in financial resource development. This *Report on Philanthropic Giving* gives special focus to the latter area.

In addition to consolidating the data from the Population Study on philanthropic giving in the Detroit Jewish community, the report discusses the policy implications of that data for the Jewish Federation in its fundraising to support human welfare, Jewish education, and cultural services required by the Jewish community both locally and overseas. It will assist in developing strategies to reach fundraising goals.

This follow up report is written by Ira Sheskin, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Geography and Regional Studies and Director of the Jewish Demography Project of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies at the University of Miami, who served as the Study Director. Linda Blumberg, Planning Director at the Jewish Federation, reviewed and contributed to this *Report*.

Lynda Giles

Michael Stein

Population Study Co-Chairs

Electronic copies of the reports from this study are available at www.jewishdetroit.org and www.jewishdatabank.org.

INTRODUCTION

The *2005 Detroit Jewish Population Study* confirms that the Jewish community is very generous, deeply rooted, involved in Jewish activities and has a close identification with Israel and a strong sense of affiliation. It also reveals that there are fewer Jews living here than in 1989 and that the community is aging with an out-migration of younger adults. These findings present both challenges and opportunities for the Jewish Federation. Among them is fundraising to meet communal needs and priorities: care of the elderly, formal and informal Jewish education, financial assistance for individuals and families in crisis, and support for our Jewish brethren in Israel and throughout the world.

A shrinking and aging Federation donor base, accompanied by an out migration of young adults, places great strain on Federation's ability to fundraise to meet these needs. It is necessary to secure the generosity of aging major donors for the future, while simultaneously building a younger new major donor base and increasing the number of donors who contribute to Federation.

Giving tzedakah is a trait that is highly valued by the majority of Jews. It is a core value of their religious upbringing, their history and communities and is critical to the health and welfare of the Jewish community locally and overseas. Philanthropic giving is central to Federation's ability to provide the support needed to sustain Jewish life and continuity. To create successful fundraising and financial resource development strategies in a changing economic and philanthropic environment, it is important that the Federation professional and lay leadership understand who gives, how much, and why.

Questions needing answers include: How does philanthropic behavior among younger adults differ from that of their elders? Will today's younger adults continue the unconditional support and commitment that the older generation has had for the Jewish community and Jewish sponsored causes in general? Will they insist on more targeted giving? Will the level of generosity be the same as their elders? Will they tend to support non-Jewish causes over Jewish ones, or non-Federation Jewish organizations more than Federation? What are the issues that resonate with donors? This report provides information to aid in our search for answers to these questions. It also discusses implications for policy and fundraising.

Linda Blumberg, Planning Director
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit
November 2007

A brief description of the methodology of this Study is found on the last page of this *Report*. An important factor to remember in examining the results in this *Report* is that some respondents may claim to have donated to charities because donating to charities is a socially-desirable action and they may wish to impress the interviewer by responding affirmatively to the philanthropy questions. For this reason, much of this report concentrates on the percentage of households who donated \$100 and over.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Report on Philanthropic Giving confirms that, while the Detroit Jewish community is very generous, the community needs to address some significant issues in order to sustain and increase giving to Federation to support needs locally, in Israel, and throughout the world. **Some key findings are:**

- * Only about 30% of Jewish households in Detroit donated \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation in 2005. Such is the case for 35% of households in the Core Area of Jewish settlement, but only 17% of households in the Non-Core Area. (See page 8 for definitions of the Core Area and Non-Core Area.)
- * Only 37% of Jewish charitable dollars are donated to the Jewish Federation.
- * The percentage of households who donate \$100 and over to the Federation increases with age from 17% of households under age 35, to 24% of households age 35-49 and 33% of households age 50 and over.
- * Donations of \$100 and over from households with children and from single persons living alone are low.
- * In-married and conversionary households are more likely to donate \$100 and over to Federation than those who are intermarried.
- * Membership in synagogues, the JCC and/or Jewish organizations correlates positively with donations of \$100 and over to Federation.
- * Formal and informal Jewish education as a child correlates positively with donations of \$100 and over to Jewish charities, but not as high as one would like for donations to Federation in particular.
- * The more familiar people are with Federation, the more likely they are to give \$100 and over; however, more than half of those who are very familiar do not donate \$100 and over.
- * Those who participate on a Jewish trip to Israel are more likely to donate \$100 and over to Federation.

Given these findings and the reality of limited resources (including time and numbers of professional staff and volunteer leadership), where should Federation concentrate its efforts to increase the number of donors and the level of donations?

As discussed in the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS) report on Philanthropic Giving (2004): “In almost every Jewish community, the easiest and most likely contributors are indeed older, wealthier, and more Jewish affiliated... These are the people who have tended to contribute in the past and are most likely to give again...” While it is important to continue to reach out to these donors and to secure their legacy for the community, **the future of the community depends on:**

- * Engaging all members of multi-generational donor families to ensure a continued legacy of giving.
- * Engaging younger donors, especially the children of current donors.
- * Engaging families with children so they pass on a tradition of giving to the community.
- * Encouraging and supporting Jewish identity building, including formal and informal Jewish educational opportunities and Israel experiences.
- * Increasing familiarity with the important work done by Federation and engaging community members in that work, whether at the Federation or through Federation affiliated agencies.
- * Reaching out to those who are members of synagogues, the JCC, and other Jewish organizations.

Strategies may include:

Fund Development

- * Continuing efforts to build a community-level campaign by appealing to donors of all income brackets.
- * Increasing efforts to encourage major donors, regardless of age, to establish endowments to support Federation priorities, and also their annual gifts in perpetuity.
- * Increasing efforts to encourage donors to make provisions for the Federation in their wills, particularly among those age 75 and over.
- * Developing a more coordinated fundraising approach with constituent agencies.
- * Increasing opportunities for Internet giving, particularly among the young.
- * Discerning through surveys and focus groups, the reasons that people who are familiar with Federation do not give.
- * Exploring personal solicitation by friends and designated giving opportunities.
- * Making JCC and synagogue members aware that the Jewish Federation provides funding to their organizations.

Engagement/Outreach

- * Concentrating efforts in the Core Area (as these are the people most likely to contribute), but simultaneously, working with existing institutions, e.g. synagogues, in the Non-Core area.
- * Focusing on engaging younger donors through outreach and creating social, leadership, and meaningful volunteer opportunities for them.
- * Creating programs and opportunities for families with children to be engaged with the Federation and its agencies.
- * Concentrating efforts on increasing donations from Orthodox households, particularly since many of these are households with children.
- * Increasing outreach to Reform households, as the percentage who donate is less than either Conservative or Orthodox households.
- * Continuing to concentrate efforts on in-married and conversionary households, as they are more likely to give, but trying to engage intermarried households Jewishly, as this is likely to increase their donations to Federation.
- * Focusing efforts on working with synagogues, as their members are more likely to give than non-members. This can include a Federation Shabbat and holiday messages.
- * Following up with participants of Israel trips and missions to build upon these experiences to encourage participants' continued engagement with the Jewish Federation.

Identity Building

- * Continuing to encourage and support Jewish identity opportunities including formal and informal Jewish education and Israel experiences for youth and adults.
- * Developing a curriculum for day and congregational schools about the Jewish community, communal needs, and Federation's role in addressing these.

Many of these strategies are already being implemented, along with others. This report emphasizes the need to continue to take a multi-pronged and multi-messaged approach toward increasing donors and donations. The generation that provided unconditional support for the Jewish community, through a strong sense of responsibility for their Jewish brethren throughout the world, is aging. The communal needs continue to grow, and it has become incumbent upon the Federation system to find new ways to engage a new generation of donors. Hopefully, this report can assist in those efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose.....	5
Part I: What Percentage of Various Groups Donate \$100+ to Charity?.....	7
Geographic Area.....	8
Age of Head of Household.....	9
Household Structure.....	10
Household Income.....	11
Jewish Identification.....	13
Type of Marriage.....	14
Membership.....	15
Formal Jewish Education as a Child.....	16
Informal Jewish Education as a Child.....	17
Familiarity with the Jewish Federation.....	18
Israel.....	19
Reasons for Giving.....	20
Part II: A Description of Households Who Donated \$500+ to the Jewish Federation in 2005	21
Part III: A Description of Households Who Donated \$1,000+ to the Jewish Federation in 2005 .. .	22
Part IV: Top Philanthropy Findings.....	23
Part V: Detroit is Different Than the Typical American Jewish Community.....	24
Conclusion	25
Methodology.....	27

PURPOSE

THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT IS ONE OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL JEWISH FEDERATIONS IN THE COUNTRY

The Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit is a success (Table 1). The 2005 Annual Campaign of \$34.9 million is the fifth highest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities. The average donation per household of \$1,165 is the highest of about 45 comparison Jewish communities. In addition, over the past three years, the Jewish Federation has coordinated capital campaigns in which a total of \$135,000,000 has been pledged. The 37% of respondents who are very familiar with the local Jewish Federation is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. The 35% excellent perceptions of the Jewish Federation is the fourth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities. The Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit is the central address of the Detroit Jewish community.

Of some concern for the future, however, and the reason for the selection of the topic of philanthropic giving for this *Report* is:

- ❶ the significant decrease in the number of donors over the past decade (a 37% decrease, 6,135 fewer donors in 2005 than in 1995); and
- ❷ that, adjusted for inflation, the Annual Campaign from 1995-2005, has increased by only about 2%.

There is also the feeling that, despite the success noted above, the Jewish Federation has the potential to be even more successful if it can reach a larger audience. And there is concern that, as the community decreases in size and ages, maintaining the current system of agencies and services will make it imperative to raise more funds.

The data presented in this *Report* will provide guidance to both those charged with setting philanthropic campaign policy and to those who actually ask thousands of members of the Detroit Jewish community to provide the necessary funds.

TABLE 1
JEWISH FEDERATION OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT
ANNUAL CAMPAIGN 1995-2005

Year	Number of:		Average Donation (Adjusted for Inflation)		Annual Campaign	
	Donors	Jewish Households in Community	Per Donor	Per Household	Not Adjusted for Inflation	Adjusted for Inflation ¹
1995	16,609	NA	\$2,068	NA	\$26,803,691	\$34,348,800
1996	16,000	NA	\$2,125	NA	\$27,319,150	\$34,005,400
1997	15,551	NA	\$2,173	NA	\$27,772,052	\$33,793,700
1998	15,393	NA	\$2,273	NA	\$29,200,000	\$34,986,300
1999	15,056	32,300	\$2,316	\$1,079	\$29,739,349	\$34,862,500
2000	14,958	NA	\$2,321	NA	\$30,610,000	\$34,716,200
2001	14,641	NA	\$2,375	NA	\$31,530,873	\$34,771,200
2002	13,508	NA	\$3,049	NA	\$37,934,610	\$41,181,900
2003	12,727	NA	\$2,845	NA	\$34,112,616	\$36,207,600
2004	11,435	NA	\$3,075	NA	\$34,043,973	\$35,167,400
2005	10,474	30,000	\$3,336	\$1,165	\$34,940,000	\$34,940,000
Increase/ (Decrease) 1995-2005	(6,135)	NA	NA	NA	\$8,136,309	\$591,200
Increase/ (Decrease) 1999-2005	(4,582)	(2,300)	\$1,020	\$85	\$5,200,651	\$77,500

¹ Amounts are adjusted to 2005 dollars using the Inflation Calculator from the Bureau of Labor Statistics web site (www.bls.gov).

Notes: ❶ The 2002 Annual Campaign included a special Israel Emergency Fund Campaign.

❷ The 2006 Annual Campaign was \$36,484,000 from about 10,500 donors.

❸ NA indicates data not available.

PART I

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF VARIOUS GROUPS DONATE \$100+ TO CHARITY?

For the purpose of this analysis, we look at charitable donations in three different *Donation Categories*:

- ❶ *Jewish Federation* refers to donations to the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit.
- ❷ *Other Jewish Charities* refers to Jewish charities other than the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit. Donations to Other Jewish Charities exclude membership dues in synagogues, Jewish Community Centers, and Jewish organizations, tuition for Jewish education programs, and Israel Bond purchases.
- ❸ *Non-Jewish Charities* refers to charities that are not specifically Jewish.

Overall, 30% of households donated \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation in the past year (2005); 48%, to Other Jewish Charities; and 53%, to Non-Jewish Charities. It is *not* surprising to find that the percentage of households who donated \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities is considerably higher than the percentage who donated \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation since the Jewish Federation is one charity and Other Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities both include multiple causes.

Note that for the purposes of simplicity, the phrase “in the past year” or “in 2005” is omitted in many places in this Report.

TABLE 2: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
All Households	30.2%	47.5%	53.2%

Consider:

- ❶ Of all charitable dollars donated by Jewish households to *Jewish* charities in the past year, 37% were donated to Federation. This is below average among 35 comparison communities
- ❷ 17% of Jewish households donated to a charity over the Internet in the past year. This rises to about one-third for households under age 35.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The results indicate that the Detroit Jewish community is very charitable, but lags behind other communities in the percentage of Jewish charitable dollars donated to Federation, only 37%. There is no doubt that the Federation is in competition with other Jewish organizations, including its own constituent agencies, for charitable dollars. This indicates that Federation and its constituent agencies should consider developing more coordinated fundraising efforts to maximize the effectiveness of requests for donations and help the community understand that supporting Federation means supporting its constituent agencies.
- ❷ Opportunities should be increased for Internet giving, particularly among the young.

GEOGRAPHIC AREA

The Facts: For the Jewish Federation and Other Jewish Charities, households in the Core Area are more than twice as likely to donate \$100 and over than are households in the Non-Core Area. For Non-Jewish Charities, households in the Core Area are also more likely to donate \$100 and over, but the difference between the two areas is much less. On the whole, households in the Non-Core Area are less Jewishly connected than are households in the Core Area: households who choose not to live in the Core Area are further from the Jewish institutions that need their support. The fact that households in the Non-Core Area do donate \$100 and over to Non-Jewish Charities at a reasonable rate implies that households in the Non-Core Area do have money to donate, but do not give Jewish causes any particular preference.

Policy Question: Should the Jewish Federation attempt to increase donations from the 27% of Jewish households who live in the Non-Core Area?

Consider:

- ❶ Many Core Area households are not donors of \$100 and over.
- ❷ Core Area households are more Jewishly connected.
- ❸ The median household income for Core Area households is \$94,000, compared to \$52,000 for Non-Core Area households.
- ❹ It is easier to reach a clustered population (as in the Core Area) than a dispersed population (as in the Non-Core Area).
- ❺ Households in the Core Area live much closer to the institutions that Federation supports.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The Jewish Federation should concentrate fundraising efforts in the Core Area.
- ❷ In the Non-Core Area, advertising through existing Jewish institutions in these areas may be the best method for increasing donations from this dispersed population.

TABLE 3: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
GEOGRAPHIC AREA			
Core Area	34.8%	56.4%	55.8%
Non-Core Area	17.2%	22.7%	46.0%

DEFINITIONS

❶ **The Core Area.** Includes zip codes 48009, 48025, 48034, 48067, 48070, 48072, 48073, 48075, 48076, 48237, 48301, 48302, 48304, 48322, 48323, 48324, 48331, 48334, 48335, 48336, 48382, and 48390. Includes the cities of Berkley, Birmingham, Bloomfield Hills, Commerce Township, Farmington, Farmington Hills, Franklin, Oak Park, Southfield, Royal Oak, Huntington Woods, Walled Lake, and West Bloomfield.

❷ **The Non-Core Area.** Includes all other areas zip codes in the three-country area (Oakland, Wayne, and Macomb) not included as part of the Core Area.

AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

The Facts: First, note that households age 50 and over are much more likely to donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation than households under age 50. Second, the under age 35 age group is *much* more likely to donate \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities. This is related to the large young Orthodox population in Detroit who donate to Orthodox charities. A similar pattern is seen for households age 35-49. Second, for both Other Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities, but not for the Jewish Federation, a significant decrease in donations is seen between households age 65 -74 and households age 75 and over. This decrease is related to the greater likelihood that households age 75 and over contain more elderly singles than elderly couples, as shown below by the results for household structure.

Policy Question: Are special efforts needed to engage particular age groups?

Consider:

- ❶ Although not shown in the table, 38% of households under age 35 donate \$1 or more to the Jewish Federation, which is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. 46% of households age 35-49 donate \$1 or more to the Jewish Federation, which is the seventh highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities. Thus, compared to other Jewish communities, Detroit is doing very well in securing donations from young Jews.
- ❷ The fact that 61% of households under age 35 and 53% of households age 35-49 donate \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities indicates significant additional potential for these age groups.
- ❸ 38% of households under age 35 are Orthodox and only 13% are Just Jewish.
- ❹ The median household income for households under age 50 is over \$110,000.
- ❺ The median household income for households age 65-74 is \$67,000, compared to \$27,000 for households age 75 and over.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The Jewish Federation should continue to concentrate efforts to attract more young donors. In most communities, the strategy for this group is to first engage younger Jews to Judaism and the Jewish community. In Detroit, the appropriate strategy is to convince young, engaged Jews that the Jewish Federation should be a major recipient of their generosity.
- ❷ Given that the decrease in donations to the Jewish Federation between households age 65-74 and households age 75 and over is minimal, no special efforts are needed for the Annual Campaign for households age 75 and over. All households, regardless of age, should be encouraged to consider establishing endowments as a way to continue their gifts in perpetuity.
- ❸ For households age 75 and over, who may be concerned about making large donations as their health deteriorates, special efforts for encouraging provisions in wills should be considered.

TABLE 4: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD			
Under 35	17.0%	60.5%	56.2%
35 - 49	23.6%	53.3%	58.9%
50 - 64	33.1%	52.4%	62.8%
65 - 74	35.5%	50.9%	52.7%
75 and over	31.3%	31.0%	35.1%
→ 65 and over	32.8%	38.6%	41.5%

HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE

The Facts: First, note the very low levels of donations of \$100 and over to all three Donation Categories by non-elderly single households. Second, note the significantly lower donation levels of \$100 and over for elderly single households than for elderly couple households. Third, for the Jewish Federation, although not for Other Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities, donations of \$100 and over are particularly low for households with children.

Policy Question: Are special efforts needed to engage particular household structures?

Consider:

- ❶ The median household income for households with children is \$116,000.
- ❷ The median household income for non-elderly single households is \$52,000.
- ❸ The median household income for elderly single households is \$24,000, compared to \$86,000 for elderly couple households.
- ❹ Only 12% of households with children, but 29% of non-elderly single households, identify as *Just Jewish*. Just Jewish households are less likely to donate to Jewish charities.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The Jewish Federation should concentrate efforts to attract donations from households with children, in part because such households are setting the example for the next generation.
- ❷ While non-elderly single households are the least likely household structure to donate, increasing donations from this group will be difficult: household income is low and the percentage of Just Jewish households is high. In addition, non-elderly single households are not a strong group of Jewish Federation donors in any Jewish community. Thus, efforts are probably best directed elsewhere, although this is a group who, if engaged Jewishly, may eventually donate.
- ❸ The reasons for the decrease in donations between elderly couple households and elderly single households may be attributable to the fact that the spouse who died may have been the more philanthropic member of the household, a decrease in income due to the death of the spouse, and the concern about making large donations as health deteriorates. For elderly single households, special efforts for encouraging provisions in wills should be considered.

TABLE 5: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE			
Household with Children	26.6%	58.4%	60.3%
Household with Only Adult Children	36.6%	55.5%	69.6%
Non-Elderly Couple	41.0%	56.9%	75.0%
Non-Elderly Single	11.5%	34.8%	40.4%
Elderly Couple	46.2%	56.1%	51.6%
Elderly Single	23.5%	24.5%	32.0%

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

The Facts: First, as expected, donations of \$100 and over increase with household income in all three Donation Categories. Second, the Jewish Federation appears to be doing quite well at securing donations of \$100 and over from households earning an annual income under \$25,000. Third, 60% of households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation, 65% to Other Jewish Charities, and 93%, to Non-Jewish Charities.

Policy Question: Are special efforts needed to engage particular household income groups?

Consider:

- ❶ For the under \$25,000 income group, the Jewish Federation is doing quite well compared to Other Jewish Charities.
- ❷ The fact that 27% of households earning an annual income under \$25,000 are Just Jewish and only 12% are synagogue members, helps to explain the lower levels of donations for this group.
- ❸ The fact that only 17% of households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over are Just Jewish and 68% are synagogue members helps to explain the higher levels of donations for this group.
- ❹ 60% of households who donated \$100 or over and 59% of those who donated \$1,000 or more to the Federation have annual incomes of \$200,000 or over.
- ❺ 33% of households who donate \$100 or more to the Federation are age 65 or older.
- ❻ Of those who donate \$1000 or over, 19% are age 65-74 and another 23% are age 75 and over.
- ❼ Only 13% of households age 50 or over have wills that contain provisions for Jewish charities. Of those age 65-74, 19% have a provision in their wills for Jewish charities, compared to only 10% of those age 75 and over.
- ❽ The annual income for households age 35-64 is \$115,000. It is \$41,000 for households age 65 and over.
- ❾ 35% of respondents age 50 and over are aware that the Jewish Federation has a department that helps with estate planning and planned giving.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The Jewish Federation should continue to concentrate efforts to cater to larger donors, while recognizing the need to appeal to households in all income categories.
- ❷ Despite the success with the \$200,000 and over group, about one-third give \$100 and over to Non-Jewish Charities but not to the Jewish Federation. Special strategies are needed to attract this group.
- ❸ The data support the need for both major donor and community level campaigns. 29% of households who donated to Federation in 2005 earned an annual income of less than \$50,000. If the campaign were only directed to major donors, the community connections fostered by encouraging widespread campaign participation would be lost. If the Federation is the “umbrella” organization for Jewish philanthropy and the “central address” for the Jewish community, then it is important to encourage as many people as possible to participate in the Annual Campaign, and Federation and constituent agencies' programs.
- ❹ Many respondents are aware of the Jewish Federation’s department for planned giving, but do not avail themselves of its services. Increased efforts should be made to encourage donors to make provisions for the Federation in their wills, particularly among those age 75 and over.

⑤It is important to have more of the Campaign supported by endowment gifts. Since annual income is higher for those households under age 65, increased efforts are needed to encourage major donors, regardless of age, to establish endowments to support Federation priorities, and also their annual gifts in perpetuity.

TABLE 6: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
Under \$25,000	11.6%	4.5%	17.5%
\$25 - \$50,000	24.2%	45.8%	23.9%
\$50 - \$100,000	24.2%	54.5%	48.5%
\$100 - \$200,000	39.1%	62.0%	74.5%
\$200,000 and over	59.8%	65.1%	92.7%

JEWISH IDENTIFICATION

The Facts: First, Orthodox and Conservative households are somewhat more likely to donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation than are Reform households. Second, Just Jewish households are, by far, the least likely to donate \$100 and over. Third, donations of \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities decrease significantly from Orthodox to Conservative to Reform to Just Jewish households. Fourth, Orthodox households are much less likely to donate \$100 and over to Non-Jewish Charities.

Policy Question: Are special efforts needed to engage particular Jewish identification groups?

Consider:

- ❶ Median household income increases from \$54,000 for Orthodox households to \$82,000 for Conservative households and \$103,000 for Reform households. Median income is \$78,000 for Just Jewish households.
- ❷ Only 11% of Just Jewish households are synagogue members, compared to 80% of Orthodox households, 61% of Conservative households, and 54% of Reform households.
- ❸ 55% of Orthodox households are households with children, compared to 32% of Reform households, 25% of Conservative households, and 20% of Just Jewish households.
- ❹ 75% of Orthodox households donate to the Jewish Federation, compared to 65% of Conservative households, 55% of Reform households, and 29% of Just Jewish households.

Recommendations:

- ❶ The Jewish Federation should concentrate efforts to increase donations from Orthodox households, who do give, but generally donate smaller amounts. Although household income is not great, these households are significant donors to Other Jewish Charities, even in larger amounts, and many are households with children, another group on which the Jewish Federation should concentrate.
- ❷ Given the differences in donation levels between Conservative and Reform households and the higher income of Reform households, the Jewish Federation should make special efforts with Reform congregations.

TABLE 7: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION			
Orthodox	35.8%	69.0%	35.3%
Conservative	38.8%	55.7%	50.7%
Reform	28.9%	47.0%	55.9%
Just Jewish	12.3%	25.6%	55.5%

DEFINITIONS

Jewish respondents were asked whether they considered themselves Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, Jewish Humanist, Jewish Renewal, or Just Jewish. Jewish identification is a self-definition and is not necessarily based on synagogue membership, ideology, or religious practice. In fact, discrepancies between Jewish identification and practice are sometimes evident. For example, respondents may identify as Orthodox or Conservative, but report that they do not keep kosher. Respondents may identify as Reform, but report that they never attend synagogue services.

TYPE OF MARRIAGE

The Facts: First, both in-married and conversionary in-married households are about four times as likely to donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation than are intermarried households. Second, in-married households are more likely to donate to Other Jewish Charities than are conversionary in-married households, who, in turn, are more likely to donate to Other Jewish Charities than intermarried households. Third, for Non-Jewish Charities, conversionary in-married households behave like intermarried households and not like in-married households.

Policy Question: Are special efforts warranted to engage intermarried couples?

Consider:

- ❶ The 16% of married couples who are intermarried is the fourth lowest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities.
- ❷ The median household income for intermarried households is \$139,000, compared to \$114,000 for in-married households.
- ❸ Only 45% of *Jewish* respondents in intermarried households feel very much or somewhat a part of the Detroit Jewish community, compared to 92% of respondents in in-married households.
- ❹ Intermarried households are much less involved in the Jewish community than in-married households. For example, 70% of in-married households are synagogue members, compared to only 17% of intermarried households.

Recommendations:

- ❶ Despite the high median income of intermarried households, intermarried households are a relatively small percentage of the community (unlike in many other Jewish communities) and much less likely to be involved. Thus, efforts are probably best directed elsewhere, although this is a group who, if engaged Jewishly, may eventually donate.
- ❷ The Jewish Federation should continue to work with conversionary in-married households. Their levels of giving imply that such couples do not feel different, when it comes to Jewish Federation donations, than couples in which both spouses were born or raised Jewish.

TABLE 8: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
TYPE OF MARRIAGE			
In-married	41.0%	66.2%	58.4%
Conversionary	39.0%	46.5%	75.0%
Intermarried	10.4%	29.6%	77.5%

DEFINITIONS

- ❶ **In-marriage:** An in-marriage is a marriage in which both spouses were born or raised Jewish and currently consider themselves Jewish.
- ❷ **Conversionary In-marriage:** A conversionary in-marriage is a marriage in which one spouse was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born or raised Jewish, but currently considers himself/herself Jewish (irrespective of formal conversion - Jew-by-Choice).
- ❸ **Intermarriage:** An intermarriage is a marriage in which one spouse was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born or raised Jewish and does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.

MEMBERSHIP

The Facts: First, with one exception (JCC members for Non-Jewish Charities) member households of all types are more likely to donate \$100 and over to all three Donation Categories. Second, synagogue, JCC, and Jewish organization member households all donate to the Jewish Federation at about the same rate

Policy Question: Are special efforts warranted to engage member and non-member households?

Consider:

- ❶ The median household income for synagogue member households (\$107,000) is much higher than for synagogue non-member households (\$60,000).
- ❷ The median household income for JCC member households (\$95,000) is higher than for JCC non-member households (\$83,000).
- ❸ The median household income for Jewish organization member households (\$99,000) is much higher than for Jewish organization non-member households (\$78,000).
- ❹ 42% of households who are associated with the Jewish community donated \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation.

Recommendations:

- ❶ While the Jewish Federation does considerably better among member households than among non-member households, less than half of member households donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation. Reaching non-member households is much more difficult than reaching member households, who are on mailing lists and receive various Jewish community publications. Thus, further efforts need to be made to increase donations from member households, as outreach efforts with these households are more likely to be fruitful than with non-member households.
- ❷ More emphasis should be placed on the concept of a Federation Shabbat and on a greater Federation effort to market itself in High Holiday publicity.
- ❸ JCC members should be made aware that the Jewish Federation provides funding to the JCC.

TABLE 9: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP			
Member	46.2%	72.2%	61.9%
Non-Member	14.7%	23.4%	44.5%
JCC MEMBERSHIP			
Member	43.2%	63.7%	52.9%
Non-Member	27.9%	44.8%	53.4%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP			
Member	47.7%	69.8%	61.1%
Non-Member	20.4%	34.9%	48.7%

DEFINITION

A household is *associated* with the Jewish community if someone in that household is a member of a synagogue, the Jewish Community Center (JCC), or a Jewish organization.

FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD

The Facts: First, Jewish day school and synagogue school as a child appear to be about equally effective in producing adults who donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation. Second, Jewish day school as a child is more effective in producing adults who donate \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities and less effective at producing adults who donate \$100 and over to Non-Jewish Charities. Third, adults who had no Jewish education as children are much less likely to donate \$100 and over in all three Donation Categories.

Policy Question: Does formal Jewish education in Jewish day schools and synagogue schools result in greater philanthropic giving?

Consider:

- ❶ 15% of born Jewish adults attended Jewish day school as a child; 67%, a synagogue school.
- ❷ 17% of born Jewish adults received no formal Jewish education as a child.
- ❸ 22% of females, but only 13% of males, had no Jewish education as a child.
- ❹ Higher levels of Jewish education correlate strongly with Jewish connectivity. For example, 5% of married couples in households in which an adult attended a Jewish day school as a child and 15% of married couples in households in which an adult attended a synagogue school as a child are intermarried, compared to 56% of married couples in households in which no adult attended Jewish education as a child.
- ❺ Donating \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation is much lower (13%) in households in which no adult had Jewish education as a child than in households in which an adult attended either synagogue school (34%) or Jewish day school (30%).

Recommendations:

- ❶ Because formal Jewish education as a child correlates well with almost every measure of Jewish identity as an adult, including philanthropic donations, the Jewish Federation should continue to encourage Jewish education for children.
- ❷ Much evidence provides support to the idea that more intensive levels of Jewish education result in more Jewishly-connected adults. While this is the case for donations of \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities, it is *not* the case for donations of \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation. The Jewish Federation should consider the production of a curriculum for both Jewish day and synagogue schools that explains the structure of the organized Jewish community and the support the Jewish Federation provides to Israel, to Jews overseas, and to the Detroit Jewish community. For older grades, the curriculum should make clear the Federation's role in supporting Jewish education.
- ❸ The Jewish Federation should continue its support of synagogue schools, which are as effective as Jewish day schools in Detroit at producing adults who donate \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation.

TABLE 10: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
ADULT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD			
To Jewish Day School	29.9%	63.2%	43.1%
To Synagogue School	34.4%	50.4%	59.4%
No	12.9%	19.2%	34.4%

INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD

The Facts: First, the three forms of informal Jewish education as a child examined in the table below have their greatest correlation with donations of \$100 and over to Other Jewish Charities. Second, Jewish sleep away camp has a relatively weak correlation with donations of \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation and participation in Hillel/Chabad has no correlation. Third, Jewish sleep away camp has a relatively strong correlation with donations of \$100 and over to Non-Jewish Charities.

Policy Question: Does informal Jewish education result in greater philanthropic giving?

Consider:

- ❶ 42% of born Jewish adults attended or worked at a Jewish sleep away camp as a child; 47%, regularly participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager; and 24%, participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college.
- ❷ Higher levels of informal Jewish education correlate strongly with Jewish connectivity. For example, 65% of households in which an adult attended Jewish sleep away camp as a child are synagogue members, compared to only 35% of households in which no adult attended Jewish sleep away camp as a child. Synagogue members are much more likely to donate to charities than synagogue non-members.

Recommendations:

- ❶ Because informal Jewish education as a child correlates well with almost every measure of Jewish identity as an adult, including donations to Other Jewish Charities, the Jewish Federation should continue to encourage these forms of informal Jewish education for children.
- ❷ Federation's role in funding informal Jewish education needs to be trumpeted with participants and their families.

TABLE 11: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH SLEEP AWAY CAMP AS A CHILD			
To Sleep Away Camp	34.1%	60.3%	58.1%
No	26.4%	35.4%	48.2%
ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD WAS ACTIVE IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER			
In Youth Group	33.8%	61.1%	54.0%
No	25.8%	31.1%	52.0%
ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)			
Hillel/Chabad Participant	35.3%	65.1%	55.2%
No	33.6%	49.1%	60.4%

FAMILIARITY WITH THE JEWISH FEDERATION

The Facts: First, households in which the respondent is more familiar with the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit are more likely to donate \$100 and over in all three Donation Categories. Second, the correlation between donations and familiarity is greater for the Jewish Federation and Other Jewish Charities than for Non-Jewish Charities.

Policy Question: Does greater familiarity with the Jewish Federation result in increased donations?

Consider:

- ❶ The 37% of respondents who are very familiar with the local Jewish Federation is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities.
- ❷ The 20% of respondents who are not at all familiar with the Jewish Federation is the fourth lowest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities.
- ❸ 73% of households in which the respondent is very familiar with the Jewish Federation donate \$1 and over.
- ❹ Of households who are very familiar or somewhat familiar with the Jewish Federation and perceive the Jewish Federation as excellent, only 45% donate \$100 and over (and 73% donate \$1 and over) to the Jewish Federation

Recommendation:

While the relationship between donations of \$100 and over and the respondent's level of familiarity with the Jewish Federation is strong, the fact that more than half of respondents who are very familiar do not donate should be cause for concern. Thus, these results suggest that survey research or focus groups that aim to discern the reasons why more than half of households who are very familiar with the Jewish Federation do not donate at the \$100 and over level (and more than one-fourth do not donate at all) should be considered.

TABLE 12: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
FAMILIARITY WITH JEWISH FEDERATION			
Very Familiar	45.9%	68.0%	62.9%
Somewhat Familiar	26.2%	45.9%	48.6%
Not at All Familiar	8.7%	12.2%	45.5%

ISRAEL

The Facts: First, households in which an adult visited Israel, particularly on a Jewish trip, are much more likely to donate \$100 and over to both the Jewish Federation and Other Jewish Charities than are households in which no adult visited Israel. Second, the respondent's emotional attachment to Israel is highly correlated with donations of \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation and Other Jewish Charities, but not to Non-Jewish Charities.

Policy Question: Do visits to Israel result in greater philanthropic giving?

Consider:

- ❶ The 29% of households who have had a member visit Israel is the fifth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities.
- ❷ The 56% of respondents who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the third highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities.
- ❸ Visits to Israel correlate strongly with measures of Jewish connectivity. For example, 2% of married couples in households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip and 6% of married couples in households in which an adult visited Israel on a general trip are intermarried, compared to 37% of married couples in households in which no adult visited Israel.

Recommendation:

The Jewish Federation should capitalize on the strong relationships between visits and emotional attachment to Israel and donations by continuing to support missions to Israel and following up with participants after the trips.

TABLE 13: DONATED \$100 AND OVER IN 2005

	Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Charities	Non-Jewish Charities
ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD VISITED ISRAEL			
On Jewish Trip	52.5%	59.3%	55.5%
On General Trip	31.8%	36.0%	38.9%
No	14.7%	30.9%	54.5%
LEVEL OF EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL			
Extremely Attached	44.2%	67.3%	54.1%
Very Attached	36.2%	55.5%	48.0%
Somewhat Attached	20.7%	36.2%	53.9%
Not Attached	10.2%	15.6%	61.8%

DEFINITIONS

- ❶ **Jewish Trip:** A Jewish trip to Israel is a trip sponsored by a Jewish group, such as a Jewish Federation, a synagogue, or a Jewish organization such as B'nai B'rith. Households containing members who visited Israel on both a Jewish trip and a general trip are reported under *Jewish Trip*.
- ❷ **General Trip:** A general trip to Israel is either a trip sponsored by a non-Jewish group or a commercial company, or a trip in which one visits Israel on one's own.

REASONS FOR GIVING

The Facts: The main reasons that respondents in households who donated \$100 and over to the Federation or other Jewish charities donated were “supporting the people of Israel,” “helping Jews in Detroit who are in financial need,” and “providing support services for the Jewish elderly.” “Providing Jewish education for children,” while not ranked as high, still garnered considerable support. Respondents also indicated that they would donate more if they were asked by a close friend or had more say over how the money was spent.

Policy Question: What are the main reasons that Jews in Detroit donate? Would solicitation by friends and a designated giving approach increase donations?

Consider:

❶ Respondents in households who donated \$100 and over to Jewish Federations or Other Jewish Charities in 2005 were asked how important five factors were in their decision to donate to a Jewish organization:

- a. “supporting the people of Israel” (65% very important; 30%, somewhat important; 5%, not at all important).
- b. “helping Jews in Detroit who are in financial need” (63% very important; 34%, somewhat important; 3%, not at all important).
- c. “providing support services for the Jewish elderly” (62%, very important; 34%, somewhat important; 4%, not at all important).
- d. “providing Jewish education for children” (59%, very important; 33%, somewhat important; 7%, not at all important).
- e. “helping Jews overseas who are in distress” (39%, very important; 48%, somewhat important; 13%, not at all important).

❷ Respondents in households who donated \$100 and over to the Jewish Federation in 2005 reported that they would donate more to the Jewish Federation if they:

- f. “were asked by a close friend.” (22%)
- g. “had more say over how the money was spent.” (21%)
- h. “were asked in person.” (14%)

Recommendation:

❶ Federation's highest priorities—supporting services for older adults, Jewish education, Israel, and individuals and families in economic crisis—resonate with donors. This finding suggests that donors recognize Federation's work as being worthwhile, and to increase giving, it is important to inform them of the needs in these areas and how funding is being used to make a difference.

❷ The fact that 22% of donors of \$100 and over said that they would donate more “if asked by a close friend” and 21% would do so if they had “more say over how the money was spent” indicate that personal solicitation by friends and designated giving opportunities should be explored as ways to increase giving.

PART II

A DESCRIPTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WHO DONATED \$500+ TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION IN 2005

A very high percentage of the money donated to the Annual Campaign derives from households who donate \$500 and over. This section provides a brief profile of these households, many of whom are solicited in person or at events.

- * 93% live in the Core Area.
- * 20% are under age 50; 40%, age 50-64; 15%, age 65-74; and 26% age 75 and over.
- * 27% are elderly couple households; 27%, households with children; 20%, non-elderly couple households; 10%, households with only adult children; 1%, non-elderly single households; and 4%, other household types.
- * 5% earn an annual income under \$50,000; 10%, \$50,000-\$100,000; 33%, \$100,000-\$200,000; and 53%, \$200,000 and over.
- * 4% are Orthodox households; 42%, Conservative; 1%, Reconstructionist; 35%, Reform; 10%, Just Jewish; and 7%, Jewish Humanist.
- * 85% have a Mezuzah on the front door; 94% always/usually participate in a Passover Seder; 83% always/usually light Chanukah candles; 37% always/usually light Sabbath candles; 26% keep a kosher home; 11% keep kosher outside the home; 3% always/usually/sometimes have a Christmas tree.
- * 31% attend services once per month or more; 11% never attend services.
- * 65% used the Internet for Jewish-related information in 2005 and 82% always/usually read *The Detroit Jewish News*.
- * 52% attended adult Jewish education in 2005.
- * 85% of married couples are in-married; 10% conversionary in-married; and 5%, intermarried.
- * 81% are synagogue members; 21%, JCC members; and 66% Jewish organization members.
- * 62% participated in a Detroit JCC program in 2005.
- * 68% feel very much a part of the Detroit Jewish community; 24%, somewhat; 7%, not very much; and 1%, not at all.
- * 86% attended a synagogue school as a child; 9%, a Jewish day school; 4% received no formal Jewish education; and 1% had a tutor.
- * 56% attended or worked at a Jewish sleep away camp as a child.
- * 63% were active in a Jewish youth group as a teenager.
- * 23% participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (other than the High Holidays).
- * 68% are very familiar with the Jewish Federation; 29%, somewhat familiar; and 3%, not at all familiar.
- * 49% of respondents who are very familiar or somewhat familiar with the Jewish Federation perceive it as excellent; 44%, good; 5% fair; and 1%, poor.
- * 60% visited Israel on a Jewish trip; 22%, on a general trip; and 18% have not visited Israel.
- * 37% are extremely attached to Israel; 35%, very attached; 25%, somewhat attached; and 3%, not attached.
- * 6% did not donate to Other Jewish Charities in 2005; 7%, under \$100; 20%, \$100-\$500; 16%, \$500-\$1,000; and 51%, \$1,000 and over.
- * 2% did not donate to Non-Jewish Charities in 2005; 11%, under \$100; 21%, \$100-\$500; 26%, \$500-\$1,000; and 40%, \$1,000 and over.
- * 61% volunteered for a Jewish organization in 2005 and 49% for a non-Jewish organization.

PART III

A DESCRIPTION OF HOUSEHOLDS WHO DONATED \$1,000+ TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION IN 2005

A very high percentage of the money donated to the Annual Campaign derives from households who donate \$1,000 and over. This section provides a brief profile of these households, many of whom are solicited in person or at events.

- * 91% live in the Core Area.
- * 14% are under age 50; 45%, age 50-64; 19%, age 65-74; and 23% age 75 and over.
- * 34% are elderly couple households; 27%, households with children; 21%, non-elderly couple households; 8%, households with only adult children; 1%, non-elderly single households; and 2%, other household types.
- * 1% earn an annual income under \$50,000; 6%, \$50,000-\$100,000; 34%, \$100,000-\$200,000; and 59%, \$200,000 and over.
- * 2% are Orthodox households; 46%, Conservative; 2%, Reconstructionist; 33%, Reform; 8%, Just Jewish; and 8%, Jewish Humanist.
- * 84% have a Mezuzah on the front door; 94% always/usually participate in a Passover Seder; 83% always/usually light Chanukah candles; 37% always/usually light Sabbath candles; 24% keep a kosher home; 8% keep kosher outside the home; 2% always/usually/sometimes have a Christmas tree.
- * 30% attend services once per month or more; 9% never attend services.
- * 75% used the Internet for Jewish-related information in 2005 and 81% always/usually read *The Detroit Jewish News*.
- * 59% attended adult Jewish education in 2005.
- * 86% of married couples are in-married; 8% conversionary in-married; and 6%, intermarried.
- * 83% are synagogue members; 22%, JCC members; and 71% Jewish organization members.
- * 71% participated in a Detroit JCC program in 2005.
- * 71% feel very much a part of the Detroit Jewish community; 27%, somewhat; 2%, not very much; and 0%, not at all.
- * 90% attended a synagogue school as a child; 7%, a Jewish day school; 2% received no formal Jewish education; and 1% had a tutor.
- * 55% attended or worked at a Jewish sleep away camp as a child.
- * 63% were active in a Jewish youth group as a teenager.
- * 20% participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (other than the High Holidays).
- * 76% are very familiar with the Jewish Federation; 24%, somewhat familiar; and 0%, not at all familiar.
- * 54% of respondents who are very familiar or somewhat familiar with the Jewish Federation perceive it as excellent; 42%, good; 3% fair; and 1%, poor.
- * 65% visited Israel on a Jewish trip; 21%, on a general trip; and 14% have not visited Israel.
- * 38% are extremely attached to Israel; 35%, very attached; 26%, somewhat attached; and 1%, not attached.
- * 1% did not donate to Other Jewish Charities in 2005; 8%, under \$100; 19%, \$100-\$500; 13%, \$500-\$1,000; and 59%, \$1,000 and over.
- * 1% did not donate to Non-Jewish Charities in 2005; 9%, under \$100; 15%, \$100-\$500; 27%, \$500-\$1,000; and 49%, \$1,000 and over.
- * 69% volunteered for a Jewish organization in 2005 and 31% for a non-Jewish organization.

PART IV

TOP PHILANTHROPY FINDINGS

This next two sections summarize the most important findings of the 2005 Detroit Jewish Population Study on the topic of philanthropy. Readers interested in more detail on any of the findings should see Chapters 14-15 of the *Main Report* and pages 103-118 of the *Summary Report*, both available at www.jewishdetroit.org and www.jewishdatabank.org.

1. 94% of households reported that they donated to one or more charities, either Jewish or non-Jewish, in 2005.
2. 55% of households reported that they donated to the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit (JFMD) in 2005.
3. 68% of households reported that they donated to Other Jewish Charities (Jewish charities other than Jewish Federations) in 2005.
4. 78% of households reported that they donated to Jewish charities in 2005.
5. 85% of households reported that they donated to Non-Jewish Charities in 2005.
6. 34% of households reported that they were not asked to donate to JFMD in 2005; 12% reported that they were asked, but did not donate. 18% of *households asked to donate* to JFMD in 2005 did not donate.
7. The 2005 JFMD Annual Campaign raised \$34,940,000 from 10,474 donors. The average donation *per household* was \$1,165.
8. 69% of households donated to both Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities in 2005; and 6% did not donate to any charities; 9% donated to Jewish charities but not to Non-Jewish Charities; 16% donated to Non-Jewish Charities but not to Jewish charities.
9. Of all charitable dollars donated by Jewish households in 2005, 24% were donated to JFMD; 39%, to Other Jewish Charities; and 37%, to Non-Jewish Charities.
10. Of all charitable dollars donated by Jewish households in 2005, 63% were donated to Jewish charities (*including* JFMD).
11. Of all charitable dollars donated by Jewish households *to Jewish charities* in 2005, 37% were donated to JFMD.
12. 17% of households donated to a charity over the Internet in 2005.
13. 17% of respondents age 50 and over do not have wills; 65% have wills that contain no charitable provisions; 13% have wills that contain provisions for Jewish charities; and 5% have wills that contain provisions for Non-Jewish Charities only.
14. 35% of respondents age 50 and over are aware that the Jewish Federation has a department that helps with estate planning and planned giving.
15. Respondents in households who donated \$100 and over to Jewish Federations or Other Jewish Charities in 2005 were asked how important five factors were in their decision to donate to a Jewish organization
 - a. “supporting the people of Israel” (65% very important; 30%, somewhat important; 5%, not at all important).
 - b. “helping Jews in Detroit who are in financial need” (63% very important; 34%, somewhat important; 3%, not at all important).
 - c. “providing support services for the Jewish elderly” (62%, very important; 34%, somewhat important; 4%, not at all important).
 - d. “providing Jewish education for children” (59%, very important; 33%, somewhat important; 7%, not at all important).

- e. “helping Jews overseas who are in distress” (39%, very important; 48%, somewhat important; 13%, not at all important).
- f. Respondents in households who donated \$100 and over to JFMD in 2005 reported that they would donate more to the Jewish Federation if they:
- g. “were asked by a close friend.” (22%)
- h. “had more say over how the money was spent.” (21%)
- i. “were asked in person.” (14%)

PART V

Detroit is Different Than the Typical American Jewish Community

The *Main Report* compares the results of the 2005 Detroit Jewish Population Survey with over 50 other Jewish communities. Detroit is shown to differ from many of these communities in its philanthropic giving, with Detroit being far more philanthropic than the typical American Jewish community. This section highlights those positive findings.

Compared to other Jewish communities, Detroit has:

1. The 2nd lowest percentage of households not asked to donate to the local Jewish Federation in 2005 (34%, 35 comparisons).
2. The 3rd highest percentage of households under age 35 who donated to the local Jewish Federation in 2005 (38%, 35 comparisons).
3. The 7th highest percentage of households age 35-49 who donated to the local Jewish Federation in 2005 (46%, 35 comparisons).
4. The 5th highest percentage of households who donated to the local Jewish Federation in 2005 (55%, 50 comparisons).
5. The 5th highest Jewish Federation Annual Campaign (\$34.9 million, 50 comparisons).
6. The highest average donation per household to the Jewish Federation (\$1,165, 50 comparisons).
7. The highest percentage of households who donated to the Jewish Federation in 2005 who donated \$10,000 and over (6%, 45 comparisons).
8. The highest percentage of households who donated to Other Jewish Charities (Jewish charities other than Jewish Federations) in 2005 (68%, 30 comparisons).
9. The 2nd lowest percentage of *households who donated* who donated under \$100 to Other Jewish Charities (Jewish charities other than Jewish Federations) in 2005 (30%, 25 comparisons).
10. The 3rd highest percentage of *households who donated* who donated \$1,000 and over to Other Jewish Charities (Jewish charities other than Jewish Federations) in 2005 (21%, 25 comparisons).
11. The 3rd highest percentage of households who donated to both Jewish Federations and Other Jewish Charities in 2005 (46%, 30 comparisons).
12. The 4th highest percentage of households who donated to Non-Jewish Charities in 2005 (85%, 45 comparisons).
13. The highest percentage of households who donated to both Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities in 2005 (69%, 40 comparisons).
14. The highest percentage of households who donated to Jewish charities (*including Federations*) in 2005 (78%, 45 comparisons).
15. The 2nd highest percentage of households who donated to charities, either Jewish or non-Jewish, in 2005 (94%, 40 comparisons).
16. The 4th highest percentage of all charitable dollars donated by Jewish households that were donated to Other Jewish Charities in 2005 (Jewish charities other than Jewish Federations) (39%, 30 comparisons).

CONCLUSION

As discussed in the National Jewish Population Study (NJPS) report on Philanthropic Giving (2004): “In almost every Jewish community, the easiest and most likely contributors are indeed older, wealthier, and more Jewish affiliated... These are the people who have tended to contribute in the past and are most likely to give again...” While it is important to continue to reach out to these donors and to secure their legacy for the community, **the future of the community depends on:**

- * Engaging all members of multi-generational donor families to ensure a continued legacy of giving.
- * Engaging younger donors, especially the children of current donors.
- * Engaging families with children so they pass on a tradition of giving to the community.
- * Encouraging and supporting Jewish identity building, including formal and informal Jewish educational opportunities and Israel experiences.
- * Increasing familiarity with the important work done by Federation and engaging community members in that work, whether at the Federation or through Federation affiliated agencies.
- * Reaching out to those who are members of synagogues, the JCC, and other Jewish organizations.

Strategies may include:

Fund Development

- * Continuing efforts to build a community-level campaign by appealing to donors of all income brackets.
- * Increasing efforts to encourage major donors, regardless of age, to establish endowments to support Federation priorities, and also their annual gifts in perpetuity.
- * Increasing efforts to encourage donors to make provisions for the Federation in their wills, particularly among those age 75 and over.
- * Developing a more coordinated fundraising approach with constituent agencies.
- * Increasing opportunities for Internet giving, particularly among the young.
- * Discerning through surveys and focus groups, the reasons that people who are familiar with Federation do not give.
- * Exploring personal solicitation by friends and designated giving opportunities.
- * Making JCC and synagogue members aware that the Jewish Federation provides funding to their organizations.

Engagement/Outreach

- * Concentrating efforts in the Core Area (as these are the people most likely to contribute), but simultaneously, working with existing institutions, e.g. synagogues, in the Non-Core area.
- * Focusing on engaging younger donors through outreach and creating social, leadership, and meaningful volunteer opportunities for them.
- * Creating programs and opportunities for families with children to be engaged with the Federation and its agencies.
- * Concentrating efforts on increasing donations from Orthodox households, particularly since many of these are households with children.
- * Increasing outreach to Reform households, as the percentage who donate is less than either Conservative or Orthodox households.
- * Continuing to concentrate efforts on in-married and conversionary households, as they are more likely to give, but trying to engage intermarried households Jewishly, as this is likely to increase their donations to Federation.

- * Focusing efforts on working with synagogues, as their members are more likely to give than non-members. This can include a Federation Shabbat and holiday messages.
- * Following up with participants of Israel trips and missions to build upon these experiences to encourage participants' continued engagement with the Jewish Federation.

Identity Building

- * Continuing to encourage and support Jewish identity opportunities including formal and informal Jewish education and Israel experiences for youth and adults.
- * Developing a curriculum for day and congregational schools about the Jewish community, communal needs, and Federation's role in addressing these.

Many of these strategies are already being implemented, along with others. This report emphasizes the need to continue to take a multi-pronged and multi-messaged approach toward increasing donors and donations. The generation that provided unconditional support for the Jewish community, through a strong sense of responsibility for their Jewish brethren throughout the world, is aging. The communal needs continue to grow, and it has become incumbent upon the Federation system to find new ways to engage a new generation of donors. Hopefully, this report can assist in those efforts.

METHODOLOGY

The results in this report are based upon a Telephone Survey conducted by International Communications Research (ICR), a market research firm in Media, PA in November and December 2005 consisting of 1,274 24-minute telephone interviews. 403 interviews were conducted from a random digit dialing (RDD) sample and 871 interviews were conducted from a Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sample.

In RDD surveys, random telephone numbers are generated by a computer. When these random numbers were dialed, there was no guarantee that a household, let alone a Jewish household, would be reached. The introduction asked whether anyone in the household was born or raised Jewish or is currently Jewish. In total, 10,663 different numbers were dialed more than 80,200 times to obtain the 403 RDD telephone interviews.

The RDD sample was compared to the DJN sample on a number of key variables. It was found (using chi-square tests) that these two samples differed significantly on several key variables. Appropriate weighting factors were applied to correct the demographic bias introduced by DJN sampling.

Meetings were held in which community rabbis, Jewish agency executives, lay leadership, Jewish Federation staff, and the Detroit Jewish Population Study Steering Committee contributed to the development of the questionnaire.

For a complete description of the methodology of this study, see Chapter 2 of the *Main Report*.



Ira M. Sheskin, Ph.D.
Director of the Jewish Demography Project
of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies
and
Associate Professor
Department of Geography and Regional Studies
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL 33124
isheskin@miami.edu

Linda Blumberg, M.S.W.
Planning Director
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit
P.O. Box 2030
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-2030
www.jewishdetroit.org